UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Tiffany Wallace,		Civil Action No.:
v.	Plaintiff,	
Performant Recovery, inclusive,	Inc.; and DOES 1-10,	COMPLAINT
-	Defendants.	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Tiffany Wallace, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Tiffany Wallace ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Lansdowne, Pennsylvania, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

- 5. The Defendant, Performant Recovery, Inc. ("PRI"), is a California business entity with an address of 333 North Canyons Parkway, Suite 100, Livermore, California 94551, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by PRI and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
 - 7. PRI at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to the United States Department of Education (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to PRI for collection, or PRI was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. PRI Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 12. On or about February 25, 2014, Plaintiff contacted PRI after learning it had seized her income tax return.
 - 13. The failure to send such notice violated the FDCPA.

- 14. PRI did not provide any written notice to Plaintiff of its intent to garnish her taxes.
- During the conversation, Plaintiff questioned PRI as to why they took her returns without notifying her. In response, PRI's representative misleadingly said it could not contact Plaintiff because they "had it on file that [you] were represented by an attorney."
- 16. Plaintiff, however, did not have active legal representation at the time her taxes were seized.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.
- 18. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, ET SEQ.

- 19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendants used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with garnishment if the debt was not paid.
- 23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.
- 24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
- 25. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
 - 26. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR CREDIT EXTENSION</u> <u>UNIFORMITY ACT, 73 P.S. § 2270, ET SEQ.</u>

- 27. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
 - 28. The Plaintiff is a "consumer," as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 29. The Defendants are each individually a "debt collector" as defined in 73 P.S. § 2270.3.
- 30. The Defendants violated provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., which constitutes an unfair or deceptive practice under 73 P.S. § 2270.4(a).
 - 31. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III

<u>VIOLATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES AND CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW, 73 P.S. § 201-1, ET SEQ.</u>

- 32. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 33. The Defendants' violations of the Pennsylvania Fair Credit Extension Uniformity

 Act constitute per se violations under the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer

 Protection Law.
- 34. The Defendants' acts were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law.
- 35. As a result of the Defendants' violations, the Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses entitling the Plaintiff to actual, statutory and treble damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
- 3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) and 73 P.S. § 2270.5 against the Defendants;
- 4. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 2270.5(c);
- 5. Actual damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 6. Statutory damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 7. Treble damages pursuant to 73 P.S. § 201-9.2(a);
- 8. Actual damages from the Defendants for all damages including emotional

distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;

- 9. Punitive damages; and
- 10. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 9, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ JBB8445

Jody B. Burton, Esq. Bar No.: 71681 LEMBERG LAW, LLC 1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor Stamford, CT 06905

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424 Attorneys for Plaintiff